

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MICHAEL S. McCANTS,

Plaintiff,

-against-

TEAM ELECTRIC, INC.,

Defendant.

OCT 21 2019

19-CV-9565 (AJN)

ORDER OF SERVICE

ALISON J. NATHAN, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff brings this *pro se* action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17, and 42 U.S.C. § 1981, alleging that his employer discriminated against him based on his race, gender, and sexual orientation. The Court construes Plaintiff's allegations as also asserting related state-law claims. *See McLeod v. Jewish Guild for the Blind*, 864 F. 3d 154, 158 (2d Cir. 2017) (holding that where a *pro se* plaintiff's factual allegations supported claims under "well-known" provisions of state law, district courts must construe the complaint as asserting claims under those laws, "regardless of [plaintiff's] failure to check the appropriate blank on a form complaint"). By order dated October 18, 2019, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP).

DISCUSSION

A. Service on Defendant

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, he is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) ("The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)). Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of

Civil Procedure generally requires that the summons and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summons and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that a summons be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summons is issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*, 378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) (“As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals’ failure to effect service automatically constitutes ‘good cause’ for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).”).

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendant Team Electric, Inc., through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form (“USM-285 form”) for this Defendant. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue a summons and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon this Defendant.

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if his address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

B. Request for Counsel

Plaintiff filed an application for the Court to request *pro bono* counsel. (ECF No. 4.) The factors to be considered in ruling on an indigent litigant’s request for counsel include the merits of the case, Plaintiff’s efforts to obtain a lawyer, and Plaintiff’s ability to gather the facts and present the case if unassisted by counsel. *See Cooper v. A. Sargent Co.*, 877 F.2d 170, 172 (2d Cir. 1989); *Hodge v. Police Officers*, 802 F.2d 58, 60-62 (2d Cir. 1986). Of these, the merits are

“[t]he factor which command[s] the most attention.” *Cooper*, 877 F.2d at 172. Because it is too early in the proceedings for the Court to assess the merits of the action, Plaintiff’s request for counsel is denied without prejudice to renewal at a later date.

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff, together with an information package.

The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue a summon, complete the USM-285 form with the address for Team Electric, Inc., and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service.

Plaintiff’s request for counsel (ECF No. 4) is denied without prejudice to renewal at a later date.

The Clerk of Court is directed to docket this as a “written opinion” within the meaning of Section 205(a)(5) of the E-Government Act of 2002.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: *Oct 21, 2019*
New York, New York


ALISON J. NATHAN
United States District Judge

DEFENDANT AND SERVICE ADDRESS

Team Electric, Inc.
20 West 36th Street, 10th Floor
New York, New York 10018